



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,222	07/03/2003	Masatoshi Akagawa	300.1119	5751
21171	7590	07/14/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				CHANG, RICK KILTAE
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3729

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,222	AKAGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rick K. Chang	3729	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) that are not listed in item 6 below is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,11-20,22-26 and 29-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>of record</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-13, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leedy (US 5,103,557).

Leedy discloses a first detection step (col. 5, lines 1-68 and col. 6, lines 1-44); Figs. 4a-4b show first holding step and a first correction step; col. 6, lines 45-68 and entire col. 7 disclose E-beam means (maskless), forming vias and additional insulating layers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 19-20, 22-26, and 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leedy (US 5,103,557) in view of Kulkarni et al (US 5,991,699).

Leedy teaches the invention as described with respect to claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-13, 15, and 17 above, except for imaging means and a second correction step of correcting the design data so as to move the wiring line away from the terminal of the other electronic component.

Kulkarni discloses in a number of figures, for example Figs. 3 and 10b), indentifying defects and issuing corrective actions and imaging means (col. 6, lines 8-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Leedy by identifying defects such as a terminal is displaced and intersects with a wiring line and correcting the design data so as to move the wiring line away from the terminal of the other electronic component and providing imaging means, as taught by Kulkarni, for the purpose of reducing total number of defects to the electronic components and providing defects in a digitized format.

5. Claims 14, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leedy (US 5,103,557) in view of Kulkarni et al (US 5,991,699).

Leedy fails to disclose a second correction step of correcting the design data so as to move the wiring line away from the terminal of the other electronic component.

Kulkarni discloses in numerous figures, for example Figs. 3 and 10b), indentifying defects and issuing corrective actions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Leedy by identifying defects such as a terminal is displaced and intersects with a wiring line and correcting the design data so as to move the wiring line away from the terminal of the other electronic component, as taught by Kulkarni, for the purpose of reducing total number of defects to the electronic components.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/28/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Optical aligner and an electrical circuit feedback system detect the position of an individual electronic component on the semiconductor wafer and the data of the locations of the defective components is used by the CAD to recalculate the locations of the components; and the CAD (which is a computer with a hard drive(s), a CPU, RAM, ROM, etc.) holds the displacement data of the good and bad component positions.

Interviews After Final

7. **Applicant note that an interview after a final rejection must be submitted briefly in writing the intended purpose and content of the interview (the agenda of the interview must be in writing). Upon review of the agenda, the Examiner may grant the interview if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations will be denied. See MPEP 714.13 and 713.09.**


Conclusion

8. **Please provide reference numerals (either in parentheses next to the claimed limitation or in a table format with one column listing the claimed limitation and another column listing corresponding reference numerals in the remark section of the response to the Office Action) to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity (optional). Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.**

Art Unit: 3729

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rick K. Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-4564. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM to 1:30 PM, Monday through Thursday.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and (571) 273-8300 for After Final communications.



RICHARD CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

RC

July 6, 2006